

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 JOHN LITTLE,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 NIKKI BEHNER, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

Case No. C08-0146RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
COPIES OF THE ENTIRE  
RECORD; DENYING OBJECTIONS  
TO THE COURT'S PRIOR ORDER


14  
15  
16  
17 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's (1) request for copies of the  
18 entire record, and (2) objections to the order issued by the Honorable James Donohue,  
19 United States Magistrate Judge, denying plaintiff's motion for an extension of time.

20 Plaintiff requests copies of all of the documents filed in this case. He states that he  
21 was unable to retain his copies when he was released from jail in August 2008 because he  
22 was homeless. When he was re-arrested in November 2008 and re-incarcerated, the  
23 records were no longer available to him. However, plaintiff has not shown a need for  
24 copies of the all of the filings in this case. He has not specified which documents he  
25 needs or the reason he needs them. Moreover, Judge Donohue has issued a Report and

1 Recommendation recommending dismissal of plaintiff's claims. The deadline for  
2 plaintiff to file his objections to the Report and Recommendation has passed. Plaintiff  
3 did not file objections or request an extension of time to do so. For these reasons, the  
4 Court will not order the copying and mailing of the voluminous records in this case at  
5 taxpayer expense. Rather, when the Clerk of the Court mails a copy of this order to  
6 plaintiff, he should also mail a copy of the docket sheet and another copy of the Report  
7 and Recommendation with its attachments. Otherwise, plaintiff's motion for copies of all  
8 documents in the record (Dkt. #43) is DENIED.

9 Plaintiff has also filed objections to Judge Donohue's December 5, 2008 order  
10 denying plaintiff's motion "to extend time to prosecute and reinstate discovery  
11 proceedings" (Dkt. #36). For all of the reasons set forth in Judge Donohue's order,  
12 plaintiff's motion was properly denied. That order was well reasoned, and was not  
13 clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Accordingly, plaintiff's objections (Dkt. #41) are  
14 DENIED.

15  
16 DATED this 5th day of January, 2009.

17  
18   
19 Robert S. Lasnik  
20 United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25